



Your ref : P102286GBPC/ASG
Application No: GB0422419.2
Applicant : Enventure Global Technology
Latest date for reply:

Examiner : Dr Lyndon Ellis
Tel : 01633 814943
Date of report : 8 December 2004
Page 1/1

Patents Act 1977 Abbreviated Examination Report under Section 18(3)

Clarity, conciseness and plurality

1. Your patent application (as amended with your letter of 4 Oct 2004) includes numerous independent claims that have slightly different but overlapping scopes. Such a set of claims is not concise, casts doubt on the essential features of the invention and places an undue burden on a reader attempting to understand the full scope of the claimed monopoly.

2. The recently introduced *Code of Practice for patent applicants and agents*, includes the following 'best practice' guidance:

The claims as filed should not, where it might have been avoided, contain...multiple independent claims in any one category, even if only one inventive concept is present.

3. You may also wish to refer to paragraphs 14.110.1 and 14.140 of the *Manual of Patent Practice*, which are particularly relevant to this issue.
4. The claims should be amended to define the essential features of your invention using a single independent claim for each category (eg product, process, apparatus, use), and to leave non-essential features to dependent claims.
5. A lengthy set of claims in which the wording of one claim is repeated to an unnecessary extent is open to objection (*Bancroft's Application* 23 RPC 89). It follows that a set of claims is not allowable if it is framed on the American system to include a long series of claims which are independent of each other yet almost identical in subject-matter. Several of your independent claims are of this type.